

### REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application, of which Claims 1, 8, and 15 are in independent form. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks and attached Declaration of Prior Invention under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 is respectfully requested.

#### The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections of Claims 1-15

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0015490 (herein referred to as “Saare et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0015559 (herein referred to as “Yabe”). In addition, Claims 3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of the combination of Saare et al., Yabe, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0066037 (herein referred to as “Song”).

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Saare et al. has an effective date of July 16, 2003. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection by submitting herewith a Declaration of Prior Invention under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 (herein the “Declaration of Prior Invention”) along with supporting documentary evidence in the form of Exhibits A-H. The Declaration and supporting documentary evidence establish that the Applicants’ date of conception of the presently claimed invention antedates Saare et al. The Declaration and supporting documentary evidence set forth facts establishing that due diligence was used prior to the effective date of Saare et al. through to the filing of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/500,391 (the provisional application to which the present application claims priority).

Applicants note that Exhibits E and G include documents referred to as ‘profile histories’ which provide historical information (i.e., time and date information) for the document to which the profile history relates. These profile histories are generated by the system used by Applicants’ counsel to create the underlying documents (i.e., the document titled “Single Sign-

On with Notes Domino" in Exhibit E and U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/500,391 in Exhibit H) and are submitted to demonstrate the creation date and diligence related to the preparation of the documents.

Based on the Declaration of Prior Invention and supporting documentary evidence, Applicants submit that the presently claimed invention was conceived prior to the effective date of Saare et al. (i.e., July 16, 2003), and furthermore, that Applicants were diligent for the entire period from prior to the effective date of Saare et al. to the filing date of U.S. Provisional Appl. No. 60/500,391 (i.e., September 5, 2003). Thus, Applicants' invention of the subject matter claimed herein antedates the Saare et al. reference, thereby disqualifying Saare et al. as a valid prior art reference as it relates to the present application.

Because Saare et al. is not valid prior art relative to the present application, the arguments/rejections set forth by the Examiner are not specifically addressed in this response. This is not intended to express the Applicants' agreement with the substance or merit of the Examiner's statements concerning the references and/or the present application. In view of the remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections based on Saare et al. be withdrawn and that Claims 1-15 be placed in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Daniel D. Sierchio", written over a horizontal line.

Daniel D. Sierchio  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 53,591

Docket Administrator  
Lowenstein Sandler PC  
65 Livingston Avenue  
Roseland, NJ 07068